60

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH, BILASPUR

W.P. (S) No.6320 of 2006

PETITIONER		H.K. Meshram, s/o late Shri S.B. Meshram, aged about 38 years, r/o Malviya Nagar, Station Road, Durg (C.G.)
		Versus
RESPONDENTS	1	State of Chhattisgarh Through the Secretary, Department of Energy, Raipur (C.G.)
	2	Joint Secretary, Chhattisgarh State Electricity Board, Raipur (C.G.)

WRIT PETITION UNDER ARTICLE 226 OF THE CONSTITUTION OF INDIA

Appearance:

Shri J.K. Shastri with Ku. Sushma Chandel, counsel for the petitioner.
Shri Sumit Verma, Panel Lawyer, for the State/ respondent no.1 on advance copy.
Shri Rajendra Tripathi, counsel for respondent no.2.

ORAL ORDER
(21.11.2007)

SUNIL KUMAR SINHA, J.

Heard.

The petitioner, who was working on the post of Executive Engineer (T&D) and was under transfer to office of C.E(RR), CSEB, Raipur, was suspended by the competent authority vide order dated 23.9.2006 (Annexure P-8). He has challenged this order of suspension in the present writ petition and sought relief that the said order of suspension passed by respondent no.2 be set aside and he be reinstated.

Return has been filed on behalf of respondent no.2. Along-with return, respondent no.2 has filed the order dated 4th January 2007 (Annexure R-9) which shows that the petitioner who was placed under suspension vide Board's Order No.01-05/PD-I/304(366)/1393-94 dated 23.9.2006 is reinstated with immediately effect and posted in the office of S.E.(O & M) Circle, C.S.E.B., Ambikapur. It has been mentioned in the order that the period of suspension whether to be treated on duty or otherwise would be decided separately at the time of finalization of departmental proceedings initiated against the petitioner with reference to the charge sheet issued to him vide Board's memo No.01-05/PD-

61

I/304(366)/1580-81, dated 03.11.2006. It has been further mentioned in the reinstatement order that the reinstatement of the petitioner is without prejudice to the result of above mentioned departmental proceedings and also the punishment, if any, may be awarded to him.

Since the suspension order has already been revoked and the petitioner has been reinstated by the subsequent order dated 4th of January 2007 making all possible provisions regarding consequences thereof, I do not find any reason to prosecute this writ petition any more. In view of the revocation order of suspension, the entire relief claimed by the petitioner has been redressed and this petition has become infructuous, at this stage.

Accordingly, this writ petition is disposed of, as infructuous.

Sd/-
Sunil Kumar Sinha
Judge

Rao